



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/613,629	07/02/2003	Varadarajan Srinivasan	NLMI.P195	4352
25670	7590	09/07/2007	EXAMINER	
WILLIAM L. PARADICE, III 4880 STEVENS CREEK BOULEVARD SUITE 201 SAN JOSE, CA 95129			WU, JIANYE	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2616		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		09/07/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/613,629

Applicant(s)

SRINIVASAN ET AL.

Examiner

Jianye Wu

Art Unit

2616

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 03 August 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-36.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See attached "Response to Arguments".

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____ *Seema S. Rao*

13. Other: _____.

SEEMA S. RAO 8/30/07
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 8/3/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. For remarks on independent claim 1 (pages 10-12), Applicant argues that traffic class ID disclosed by Blake does not map to the traffic flow ID in the claim.

In response, Examiner maintains the position of final office action because the claim is interpreted as each packet in a set of packets that have a same ID is processed in a same way, which is what Blake teaches. The packet ID in the claim is interpreted as a variable whose value can be compared to, it is irrelevant whether the packet ID is used for a traffic flow, or for a traffic class.

Furthermore, as pointed out by Applicant (lines 8-12 of page 12), a traffic flow is normally used in end-to-end environment, while a traffic class is used in per-hop environment. The application is clearly disclosed under a per-hop environment. Therefore, the inventive concept disclosed in the application is conceptually identical to the one taught by Blake.

3. For remarks on independent claim 22 (page 13), Applicant uses the same reasoning as that of claim 1.

In response, the explanation presented above for claim 1 is applied.

4. For remarks on independent claim 12 (page 13-15), Applicant argues:

First, "Ohgane fails to disclose or suggest a CAM device in which each row stores 'a flow identification (ID) for a corresponding packet, the flow ID indicating to which traffic flow the packet belongs'".

Art Unit: 2616

Second, "Ohgane fails to disclose or suggest 'compare logic for comparing the departure times with each other to determine which departure time is the earliest'".

In response, Examiner disagree:

First, Ohgane teaches that each row in the CAM is shown in FIG. 6, which includes a CELL HEADER. Every cell header has a component of vpi/vci, which is used to identify the traffic flow. The vpi/vci is equivalent to a flow ID, as pointed out in the Final Office Action.

Applicant's interpretation of equating VC to flow ID is improper since a VC is a communication channel instead of an ID, and Applicant's statement that "virtual channel is a signal path" is also incorrect.

Second, Ohgane clearly shows a "compare logic for comparing departure times" in Fig. 4 as SELECTOR 516, as stated in the Final Office Action.

Therefore, Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Examiner maintains the position of Final Office Action.

Jianye Wu
8/22/07

